

REMARKS

The Examiner is requested to approve the accompanying replacement drawings. The changes to the drawings are to correct typographical errors in Figure 6.

The Office Action and cited references have been reviewed. Claims 1, 23, and 30 have been amended. Claims 1-36 remain pending and are at issue herein.

Specification

The Examiner has objected to the specification stating that it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. The Applicants respectfully disagree. The "code" the Examiner to which the Examiner refers in the specification is an XML schema. The XML schema is used to show how an XML document is formatted. An XML document that is formatted in accordance with the XML schema is browser-executable code, but the schema itself is not browser-executable code. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection to the specification.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, 15, and 17-36 under 35 § U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,240,444). This ground of rejection is believed overcome by the above amendments to Claims 1, 23, and 30. Reconsideration of this ground of rejection and allowance of claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, 15, and 17-36 in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully solicited.

Claims 1, 23, and 30 have been amended to state that the synchronization message indicates at least one command comprising a current relative position on the current page being navigated and viewed by the first user on the first client where the current relative position is associated with at least one corner of the current page that is currently being viewed by the first user on the first client. As stated in the instant specification, the synchronization message indicates the relative position of elements as a percentage in each of the horizontal and vertical directions. The relative position includes at least one corner (such

as the upper left-hand corner) of the current page that is currently being viewed by the first user on the first client because the first client may have a different screen size and resolution than that of the second client, such that the first client can show more or less information in its browser window than the second client can in its browser window. For example, as shown in Figure 3 of the present application, the first browser window 320 is larger than the second browser window 322, indicating that the former has a larger size than the latter. Even when the windows 320 and 322 are synchronized and have the same state, the window 320 still shows more of the web page 302 than does the second window 322. By including where on the current page that the browser window is displaying at a corner of the browser window, in the synchronization message, a portion of the same page is displayed even if the screen size and resolution of the browsers are different.

Fin et al. has been thoroughly reviewed. No teaching or suggestion could be found of sending a relative position that includes at least one corner of the current page that is currently being viewed by the first user on the first client as required by claims 1, 23, and 30.

Claims 2-3, 5-8, 10-13, 15, and 17-22 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be patentable for the same reasons set forth above. Claims 24-29 depend from claim 23 and are believed to be patentable for the same reasons set forth above. Claims 31-36 depend from claim 30 and are believed to be patentable for the same reasons set forth above.

With respect to claims 7 and 26, the Examiner states Fin et al. discloses all of the elements of claims 7 and 26. The Applicants respectfully disagree. The state referred to in Fin et al. is referring to a CCI event as stated in column 15, line 62 to column 16, line 22. No teaching or suggestion of a CCI event that indicates that the current relative position has changed and causes cobrowsing the web site on the second client by the second user to correspondingly scroll within the current page. It is respectfully submitted that the state of Fin et al. refers to the creation of the web page as indicated in Fin et al. While Fin et al. teaches the same web page being viewed, no teaching or suggestion could be found of a CCI event indicating the relative position of the web page being displayed on the browser.

With respect to claims 11, 28, and 35, column 19, lines 34-38 of Fin et al. teach that when a new web document is opened by one of the users, the same document is displayed on the screen of another user. It is respectfully submitted that displaying a document on the

screen of another user does not teach or suggest changing focus from a first browser to a second browser as required by claims 11, 28, and 35.

With respect to claims 12, 29, and 36, no teaching or suggestion could be found in Fin et al. that creating a state includes resizing the browser window of the second client in response to the first client resizing a browser window.

With respect to claims 18 to 22, Fin et al. teaches that a message director may send intercepted messages to other clients so that other clients can display the Web document and receive inputs (mouse, keypad, etc.) from other clients. It is respectfully submitted that sending intercepted messages to other clients or receiving inputs from multiple clients does not inherently transfer control from the other clients to the message director. Transferring control from the first client to the second client refers to the second client controlling the cobrowsing session.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, 15, and 17-36.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 4 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fin et al. further in view of Gudjonsson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,564,261). Claims 4 and 14 depend from claim 1. This ground of rejection is believed overcome by the above amendment to claim 1. Reconsideration of this ground of rejection and allowance of claims 4 and 14 in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully solicited. As previously stated, Fin et al. does not teach all of the elements of claim 1. Gudjonsson et al. does not teach or suggest cobrowsing. Therefore, neither Fin et al. nor Gudjonsson et al., singly or in combination, teach or suggest all of the elements of claims 4 and 14. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 4 and 14.

The Examiner has rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fin et al. further in view of Anupam et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,535,912). Claim 9 depends from claim 1. This ground of rejection is believed overcome by the above amendment to claim

In re Appln. of Alexandru Gavrilescu et al.
Application No. 09/681,488

1. Reconsideration of this ground of rejection and allowance of claim 9 in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks are respectfully solicited.

As previously stated, Fin et al. does not teach all of the elements of claim 1. Anupam et al. does not teach or suggest cobrowsing. Therefore, neither Fin et al. nor Anupam et al., singly or in combination, teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 9. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 9.

The Examiner has rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fin et al. further in view of Kumar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,253). Claim 16 depends from claim 1. This ground of rejection is believed overcome by the above amendments to claim 1. Reconsideration of this ground of rejection and allowance of claim 16 in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks are respectfully solicited.

As previously stated, Fin et al. does not teach all of the elements of claim 1. Kumar et al. does not teach or suggest cobrowsing. Therefore, neither Fin et al. nor Kumar et al., singly or in combination, teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 16. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 16.

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin L. Wingate, Reg. No. 38662
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
6815 Weaver Road, Suite 300
Rockford, Illinois 61114-8018
(815) 963-7661 (telephone)
(815) 963-7664 (facsimile)

Date: February 27, 2004



FIG. 6

